

Mounting Evidence For Authenticity of MJ-12 Documents

Robert M. Wood, Ph.D.

*Presented at the International MUFON Symposium
July 2001, Irvine, CA*

Abstract

Ever since the first “leaked” MJ-12 Eisenhower Briefing Document in 1984 describing a top-secret crash recovery program, the authenticity of UFO documents has been questioned. With the continuing exposure of hundreds of classified pages by numerous unidentified sources, the evidence favoring authenticity is mounting. This paper will update the status of the available documents, generally what they say and provide a concise status of the issues regarding authenticity, including the answers to those with a skeptical view. Of particular significance will be the results of research and forensic studies, including those on 22 pages on original paper, where chromatographic ink dating and other state of the art techniques clearly indicate that the documents were likely to have been created long ago and cannot be modern high tech fakes. The classic comparisons with archival authentic documents show the expected similarities, and the content is shown to be consistent with numerous arcane facts known to only scholars in historiography. Difficulties with identical signatures will be explored, including the astonishing possibility that the sophisticated document cover-up started in the early stages of documentation in the State Department in the 40s. Remarkably, the most likely hypothesis is that we are seeing a leak of copies of genuine documents held in personal files for decades. The conclusion is that we have had a stunningly successful UFO research cover-up for five decades and if these crashes and recoveries occurred, such documents ought to exist.

Introduction

Last year I presented a paper titled, “Validating the New Majestic Documents.” This year’s title, “Mounting Evidence for Authenticity of MJ-12 Documents” begins where the last presentation left off, presenting the results of certain forensic testing, refining previous arguments, and answering the accumulation of skeptical concerns. It would be very useful to have a copy of last year’s proceedings available as you read this paper.

Science, the extraterrestrials and the odds

Nearly everyone expects that it is unlikely that we are the only intelligent life in the universe. Given the right planet, the right composition of oxygen, you normally get bipedal results with eyes and ears on top out of the dirt. So, why do we feel obligated to require extreme odds when everyone thinks it is likely?

The acceptance of new scientific ideas usually requires theory as well as a mountain of facts. Two theoretic problems prevent the widespread acceptance of some UFOs as Extraterrestrial (ET) spacecraft: The first is the obvious inference that if so many are coming to visit that they must have figured out a way to transcend time or travel faster than light. We do not know how to do that, and furthermore, most people think that Einstein’s equations prohibit this. This is not rigorously so. The second theoretic problem is that the procedure used to obtain the enormous forces and energies to travel from star to star at these speeds. We likewise have not figured out how to do this. We also know that most constructive scientists agree that there is more to learn; that old equations get replaced with newer equations with one added term, such as those modifying $F = ma$ at high speeds.

Thus, the only thing standing in the way of having a high expectation that some UFOs are ET spacecraft is the near-certainty that we will achieve a better understanding of physics.

One can conclude that it is *likely* that we have been visited, and ordinary, not extraordinary, proof is all that is required. Sagan and Shklovsky took this view in their classic book, “Intelligent Life in the Universe,” where they discussed historical ET visitors.

Moving away from the scientist’s view is that of the common man, who often asserts that if there had been landings and we had recovered craft, that the government would not want to keep this secret, and besides, “everyone knows that governments can not keep secrets effectively.” The former is naive and the latter is false, as evidenced by examples: the Manhattan Project to develop the atomic bomb, the invasion of Normandy, the decoding of the Japanese and German codes, and the development of stealth aircraft. These secrets were known to the thousands of people who worked on them but those who should not know did not.

The whole point of this preamble is to put you in a the frame of mind that says that if you find a highly classified “leaked” government document, that it is at least equally likely that it is genuine as it is fake.

Such Documents Should Exist

For those people who have spent careful attention to the mass of literature on the subject of UFO reality there would, we suspect, be a fair degree of agreement that alien craft crashed in New Mexico and maybe other places too, that they have been seen at close range, that they leave marks on the ground, and that they appear to have occupants.

If this is true, it is inconceivable that we, the United States, would not have initiated a project to find out everything we can, and do it in great secrecy. It is a virtual certainty that such a project would have had some written records over the years. It is also widely believed that documents “leak” and that “people cannot keep secrets.” If this is so, we would be expecting to have some documents surface, and we have some. The only question is whether they are genuine or whether they are fake. The usual tools of questioned document examiners must be brought to bear on the question of which are genuine and which are not. This is what we are doing.

Taking this logic farther, it is necessary to evaluate each document on its own merits, and the individual attributes of provenance, typography, and content including relations to chronology and possible authorship. The remarkableness of the content sometimes makes some people react subconsciously to reject the stories as too bizarre. The scientific method uses a systematic approach without letting emotions affect the probability of fakery vs. genuineness. Specifically, the argument that one of the documents *could be* easily faked and therefore *was* faked is illogical. The determination of fakery is a question for the questioned document examiner, using all the tools of the trade and expertise of the subject. The argument that “anything can be faked these days with high technology” ignores the fact that some of these documents were recorded to be on the scene before the arrival of the more modern electronic simulation programs.

To take the position that without proof of genuineness they are fake is illogical because of the certainty that such documents exist if crashes have occurred. Similarly, to take the position that, without proof of fakery, they are genuine is also illogical because it is certainly true that some fake documents might exist. This logic says that, before a questioned document determination, *it is equally likely that they are genuine as that they are fake.*

Background of MJ-12 Documents: Scope, Sources, Pages

One of the first questions often asked is in regards to where the documents came from, and how many pages there are. A simple answer is to show these in a table, included as Table 1. This table is a synopsis of the more precise data included on the website www.majesticdocuments.com. It can be seen that roughly 70% of the documents are classified, usually Secret or Top Secret Code Word, accounting for more than 10% of the pages. With almost no exceptions, there has been no official government release of any of this material, although the packages were mailed from government facilities in two instances (CIA internal mailbox and the FOIA office at Ft. Meade). These contents are now in the public domain.

Some skeptics have attempted to convince themselves that Tim Cooper somehow created this mass of material. If the author had not gone to see him, the documents might well have stayed in his attic. No doubt, however, the early exposure of the documents surely did trigger other sources to come forward with their papers. The least unlikely hypothesis is that these sources have been keeping this material in their files for their lifetimes, do not know what to do with it, and somehow sense that it is in the public interest to “tell the story.”

The story the documents tell is highly consistent from document to document, era to era. The more recently leaked documents begin with the famous Los Angeles “Air Raid” of 1942 and the alleged recovery of two craft on that occasion, triggering George Marshall (Chief of Staff) to set up the Interplanetary Phenomenon Unit, and President Roosevelt to reject an all-out ET effort until we had won the war. This opened the door for President Truman and Vannevar Bush to pick up without losing tempo, so when the 1947 crashes occurred, our special military recovery teams were ready. Afterwards, our recovery program successfully seems to have begun the process of reverse engineering, but our documents run out before we know the answer from them. The details of many of the documents can be inspected on our website: www.majesticdocuments.com. Where noted with a page number on Table 1, about half of the list is available in print in the softback book, “The Majestic Documents,” which can be ordered on the website.

Document Identification (with beginning page number in "The Majestic Documents" book)	Source and provenance	Document Date	Date Received	No. Total pp.	No. Classified pp.
Eisenhower Briefing Document (EBD) (p.121)	Shandera via the USPS, Albuquerque PM	Oct 52	Dec 84	7	7 TSMEO
Truman to Forrestal memo (p. 83)	Shandera via the USPS, Albuquerque PM	Sep 47	Dec 84	1	1 TSEO
Cutler-Twining memorandum	William Moore, National Archives	Jul 54	Jul 85	1	1
Air Accident Report (p. 21)	Tim Cooper from an Amer. Legion member	Jul 47	1992	4	4 TS
Marilyn Monroe Report	Tim Cooper from a former CIA archivist	Aug 62	1992	1	1
Hamel/Marshall to Truman (p. 85)	Cooper from Cantwell via USPS	Sep 47	Oct 92	1	1 TSMEO
Interplanetary Phenomenon Unit Field Order (IPU) (p. 15)	Cooper from Cantwell via USPS	Jul 47	93-96	1	1 TS
JFK to Director, CIA (p. 187)	Cooper from Cantwell via USPS	Jun 61	93-96	1	1
JFK to a Director of the CIA (p. 189)	Cooper from Cantwell via USPS	Nov 63	93-96	1	1 TS
Hillenkoetter MAJIC memo (p. 41)	Cooper from Cantwell via USPS	Sep 47	93-96	1	1 TSEO
Nine short memos via Cantwell	Cooper from Cantwell via USPS	1947	93-96	13	9 C or up
Special Operations Manual (p. 133)	Quillan Pharmacy, LaCrosse via Don Berliner	Apr 54	Mar 94	23	23 TSMEO
IPU Report (p. 27)	Cooper from Cantwell personally	Jul 47	Jul 95	7	7 TS
"First" Annual Report (p. 87)	Cooper from Cantwell personally	Sep 47	Jul 95	17	17 TS
Einstein/Oppenheimer memo (p. 3)	Cooper from Salina via USPS	Jun 47	Jun 96	6	6 TS
Directive to Twining from Ike (p. 17)	Cooper from Salina via USPS	Jul 47	Jun 96	1	1 TS
Directive:Twining from Truman (p. 19)	Cooper from Salina via USPS	Jul 47	Jun 96	1	1 TSEO
Twining "White Hot" report (p. 43)	Cooper from Salina via USPS	Sep 47	Jun 96	19	19 MEO
Bowen manuscript, "An Encyclopedia of Flying Saucers"	Cooper from Ft. Meade Army Intel. FOIA	1954	Jun 99	335	C or TSM
Ten short memos via Salina	Cooper from Salina via USPS	47-55	Jun 96	11	2 S or up
23 Unclassified documents	Cooper from Source S-2 personally	various	Sep 99	1948	0
Twenty documents	Cooper from Source S-2 personally	various	Sep 99	525	28 S
Five documents	Cooper from Source S-2 personally	various	Oct 99	403	0
"Burned" memo	Cooper from Source S-1 by USPS (CIA PM)	Est 69	Feb 00	9	9 TSM
Wright-Patterson Library note	Cooper from Source S-1 by USPS (CIA PM)		Feb 00		
Photographs of documents, 3x5 in.	Cooper from Source S-1 by USPS (CIA PM)	various	Feb 00	44	44
Photographs of craft and people	Cooper from Source S-1 by USPS (CIA PM)	various	Feb 00	76	76
Eight documents	Cooper from Source S-1 by USPS (CIA PM)	various	Feb 00	20	10 S or up
Marshall to Roosevelt memo	Cooper from Source S-3 via USPS	42	Apr 00	1	1 TS
Roosevelt to Non-terrestrial Science Committee	Cooper from Source S-3 via USPS	Feb 44	Apr 00	1	1 Double TS
Bush letter to Truman	Cooper from Source S-3 via USPS	Apr 44	Apr 00	2	2 TS
Total Number of documents = 100	Total number of sources = 11			3492	490

Table 1. Many sources have provided documents. Original wrappers and envelopes exist. Even more detail is provided in the website www.majesticdocuments.com. More than 2/3 of the documents were classified. (TS=Top Secret, M=Majic or MJ-12, C=Confidential, EO=Eyes Only)

Characterizing The Documents Physically

The spectrum of paper characteristics runs the gamut: modern xerographic copies of old carbons, photos of pages of documents, original carbon copies, original old replicas, and original typewritten pages. If the paper is original and old, watermarks can be identified, and there are also pen and ink markings. In some cases the typewriter impressions are clear enough to identify the typewriter make and year. There are stamps (time stamps, security stamps, numbering stamps) available for inspection and correlation with known usage. In the case of the Special Operations Manual, this author had extensive personal interactions with professionals at the U.S. Government Printing office, gaining insight about type fonts, styles, and processes that would have been used if it had been printed in 1954 as stated. An examination of the 1959 USGPO publication, "Specimens of Type Faces" has revealed two fonts for the sans-serif bold headers that could have been used in the era: the Franklin Gothic and the Square Gothic, the latter seeming to be slightly closer to the images in the original photographs because of the constancy of line thickness and because of the letter spacing. If Square Gothic was used, this puts to rest the suggestion that Helvetica type, not invented until a more modern era, "proved" that it was a fake.

Meaningful Skeptical Inquiries

The process of authentication proof with so many different documents includes a very wide range of considerations, such as:

- Physical dating of the ink, pencil and paper
- Dating by matching the reproductive process (typewriter or printer)
- Dating by use of language of the period
- Identification of authorship using linguistics
- Comparison of handwriting
- Comparison with known events of record
- Comparison with known styles and procedures of production
- Comparison with known or expected security procedures
- Logic of content
- Records of provenance

Evaluation of Questioned Documents with Forensics

My partner (Ryan Wood) and I have consulted with two specialized entities for the evaluation of the selected documents at issue. The first is James Black, a Fellow of the Questioned Documents Section of the American Academy of Forensic Sciences and a former chairman of the Questioned

Documents Subcommittee of the American Society of Testing and Materials. For examination of paper and ink, he recommended the Speckin Forensic Laboratories. Their qualifications are available at www.4n6.com. The following kinds of tests have been pursued with these consultants.

Comparison of Typewriters and Identification

James Black has thousands of typewriter impressions for reference (one with a carbon and one with a ribbon) and a working knowledge of what he has. He is able to look at a typewriter impression, (especially if it is an original) and go quickly to the exemplars for comparison. It was in this manner, for example, that he easily established that the Truman/Forrestal memo was typed on a 1940 Underwood. There is no mystery to this process. Prior claims for a different, later, typewriter are without foundation (Moore & Shandera 1990).

Identification of Watermarks and Timeline

If the paper is original and has a clear watermark, it can be enhanced and copied on specialized equipment. One such watermark, “Royal Writing,” was traced to The S. E. & M. Vernon Company, out of business by the 1960s. Other watermarks, such as the Eagle watermark on the “Burned Memo,” are consistent with government-style usage although the individual manufacturing dates are not always available.

Identification of Pencils, Inks and Timelines

It is possible to remove a very small sample of paper, about the diameter of a paper clip, that includes the pen or ink marks and subject it to a variety of tests, such as chromatography, and then compare the resulting spectrum with those of known pencil or pen samples. This usually permits one to state that the document is “later than” the date that such pen or pencil was manufactured. All of the results are consistent with the stated dates on the documents.

Table 2 presents a summary of the principal results of the forensic testing by these consultants. The most significant points from this detailed table are:

- A second copy of the EBD has been confirmed on non-photocopied (original) paper.
- The red ink security stamps on the Bowen manuscript and the “Burned Memo” are consistent with the stated era.
- The pencil notations about Don Menzel were made with a pencil made in the 1950s.
- The typewriter for the Truman Forrestal memo was an Underwood, circa 1940.
- The “Burned Memo” was done with Courier type introduced by IBM in 1956.
- The Bowen manuscript handwriting appears to match some in the IPU Report.
- The ink alluding to Majestic in the FTD page was manufactured by Formulabs in 1972.

Document	Pages Checked	Topic checked	Conclusion
Bowen manuscript	167, 285, 286, 287, 288, 313	Watermark	Circular type. No specific manufacturing information available.
Bowen manuscript	187, 188, 189, 190, 221, 222	Watermark	No watermark on these pages.
Bowen manuscript	227	Watermark	"Royal Writing" watermark. Black's watermark handbook book identified a manufacturer for "Royal Writing," S. E. & M. Vernon, Inc., 65 Duane NY, NY.
Bowen manuscript	All pages	Paper	Consistent with papers commercially available in the 1950s. Physical and microscopic examination.
Bowen manuscript	All pages	Typewriting	Ribbon used is consistent with those commercially available in the 1950s.
Bowen manuscript	285	Pencil writing	Solubility tests show components consistent with pencils commercially available during the 1950s. "What is DM doing" and "I hope DM keeps his big mouth shut" would thus have been written a long time ago. DM alludes to Donald Menzel.
Bowen manuscript	167, 227	Red stamp ink	Ink shows no evidence of newer components recently introduced into red inks.
Bowen manuscript	187, 188, 221, 222, 227	Felt tip ink	Not produced until at least 1962.
Bowen manuscript	188, 189, 190, 288, cover page	Ballpoint inks	Consistent with Bic Pen Co. ink manufactured for the first time in 1977.
Bowen manuscript	187, 221, 222, 285	Ballpoint inks	Consistent with ink first formulated in 1961.
Burned documents	All	Watermarks	Eagle and a shield. Manufacturer could not be located.
Burned documents	All	Red stamp ink	Not inconsistent with stamp ink commercially available during that time frame
Burned documents	All	Typewriting	Consistent with carbon transfer that was available at that time frame
FTD document	One page	Ballpoint ink	Consistent with ink first manufactured by Formulabs in 1972
NICAP cases	Two pages	Watermark	Watermark is "XEROX," not used until 1961.
NICAP cases	Two pages	Non-ballpoint ink	Ink manufactured by Faber-Castell first in 1968.
Eisenhower Briefing Documents (EBD)	Four pages, two sheets	Printing process	They were created with a printing process. No evidence that these pages were photocopied. This is a remarkable confirmation, without the page numbers of prior disclosures, of the authenticity of the Eisenhower Briefing Document.
NICAP cases	Page with locations	Non-ballpoint ink	The handwriting is being tested for a match with a distinctive handwriting in the IPU Report. (See the words, "Liaison Committee Chairman" on p31 of "The Majestic Documents." The notation states that three crashes were taken out of Blue Book because they were "TS Restricted": Corona, Socorro and WSPG.
Interplanetary Phenomenon Unit Report (7 pages)	Pages 1-7	Typewriter	This was typed on a type-bar instrument. The reproductive quality of the document is too poor to permit typewriter identification. Unable to find any evidence that would impeach the stated date of July 22, 1947.
JFK memo November 12, '63	One page	Typewriter	Was typed on either a Remington Standard, Remington Portable, Royal Standard or Royal Portable. Ms. Lincoln, JFKs secretary, is photographed using a Remington.
The "burned" memo	Nine pages	Typewriter	Type font of the typewriter which produced these pages is Courier, first introduced in 1956 by IBM. Vertical alignment suggests that an electric typewriter was used.
Truman-Forrestal memo	Photograph of page 008 of the EBD	Typewriter	All the type is consistent with an exemplar from Underwood Standard typed in May 1940. The numerals of September 24, 1947 are raised above the line of the text, indicative of the sheet of paper being removed between typing the text and the date. The signature may be a reproduction or produced by a pantograph.

Table 2. Every test performed is not inconsistent with the age of the ink, paper, or typewriter dating from 1977 or earlier. All of these tests were performed by professional questioned document examiners who had no knowledge or particular interest in the subject material.

Update On Concerns About Authenticity

The paper last year dealt with about 20 specific concerns regarding authenticity, largely accumulated from criticisms in papers by Deuley, Randle, and a “Joint Statement” by Aldrich, Berliner, Deuley, Hall and Rodeghier published electronically. I consider that all of these concerns have been disposed of but I will highlight a few of them in Table 3.

Reference for concern	Concern (page number in “The Majestic Documents”)	Gist of answer
Aldrich et al	In the 1954 SOM1-01 it says to tell prying eyes it was a crashed satellite, but the first satellite was launched in 1957 (p 142)	Knowledge of our satellite plans was widespread, and satellites were just one of several deceptive statements suggested. Numerous public references discussed our satellite program plans.
Aldrich et al	In SOM 1-01 it alludes to Area 51, S-4, which did not exist then. (p 145)	There is evidence for earlier involvement of the CIA at this location; the government still continues to classify the ancient history of Area 51.
Aldrich et al	Restricted and Top Secret caveats were incompatible at the time.	Examples of the use of Restricted generically have been shown together with Top Secret.
Aldrich et al	For SOM1-01, the type font on the headers is Helvetica, a font that did not exist in 1954. Our knowledge of the “graphics trade” is not current. (p 142)	Two fonts have been found that match adequately; Franklin Gothic which matches very closely, and Square Gothic, which matches precisely, both available earlier than 1959, long before Helvetica.
Aldrich et al	For SOM1-01, it would be easy to fake a hot lead printing flaw, such as a raised “z.” (p 142)	The evidence is overwhelming that the manual was printed with a hot lead press. The difficulty of replicating not only an occasional raised “z” but also the correct letter spacing is staggering.
Deuley, May 1999	Entire case rests on the Eisen-hower Briefing Document (p 121)	Most of our documents predate the EBD. In any case, another copy of the EBD has been certified as old paper.
Aldrich et al	Only a documentary paper trail of certified documents would be acceptable evidence for reality.	Such a requirement would eliminate all copies of genuine documents, the most likely way for illicit copies to exist. Not a logical requirement.
Deuley, June 1999	The title page would not have a widow, word “law.” (p 133)	Style Manual prohibits widow lines to a new page, not widow words on a new line. The Government is concerned about the cost of paper, but will print it however the paying customer wants it.
Randle, 1997	“Seal included to add visual impact.”	The use of the archaic “War Office” seal appears on official Army Manuals as late as 1969!
Greenwood, 1999	New Zealand One-Fourth Regi-ment story timing flawed.(p 100)	This is a complex question and we have postponed the answer. The people who wrote the document may have been misinformed.
Several	Presence of grammatical errors strongly suggest fakery. (p81 summarizes numerous gram-matical errors for “White Hot”)	Many of the documents are drafts, less well proofread than final copies. Errors need to be placed in the context of the author and the typist, who may or may not be the same person. Technical personnel are not always good at English.
Several	“Retro-virus” is a word anachronism, not invented until the 1970s (p 92)	Retrovirus without a hyphen has a different meaning than the collegial use of “retro-virus,” alluding to a retrograde viral evolution. This concept appeared in a 1935 paper.
Deuley, May 1999	People will fake documents for a giggle.	No person has offered any fakes that pass even simple tests for authenticity. We are eager to examine all alleged UFO-related documents for authenticity.
Friedman, July 2000	Deuterium is called light hydrogen in the “White Hot” report. Compounds are called elements. Some make no sense.	The author was clearly mystified and not sophisticated technically. The word “element” is clearly generic in this use. The impact of seeing ET technology for the first time would stress many. The best technical types may not have been cleared at the time of the report.
Deuley, May 1999	The 12 April 49 Hillenkoetter memo could have been faked inside the FOIA system. The CIA will not admit they sent it.	The memo appears totally genuine, with no signs of tampering. Looks like one that the declassifiers forgot. It would be naïve to imagine that the FOIA process is not monitored and controlled by Top Secret assets.

Table 3. Most of the reasonable questions raised by the skeptics have been satisfactorily answered.

Dealing with the concerns of skeptics is a never-ending process, because each response often engenders a rebuttal. For example, when it was complained that there was not a security page on SOM1-01, we found one on the original negatives, and then there were complaints that it had minor flaws.

The “Emulation” Problem

Several questioned documents have characteristics that are similar to previously published apparently authentic ones. These documents and the reasons why there may be a problem are shown in Table 4 below.

Emulation No.	Majestic-related (page number in “The Majestic Documents”)	Wedemeyer-related or other (page number in MUFON 2000 Proceedings)	Problem
1	From Truman to Twining, 9 Jul 47. Sends him to White Sands Proving Ground for making an appraisal. (p. 19)	Directive from Truman to Wedemeyer, 9 Jul 47. Sends him to China for making an appraisal. (p. 213)	Signatures, dates are identical. Similar language used. Twining already in New Mexico on 9 July.
2	Humelsine/Marshall to Truman 25 Sep 47. “Mandatory to treat Twining’s report top secret.” (p. 85)	Humelsine/Marshall to Connelly, 25 Sep 47. “Mandatory to treat Wedemeyer’s report top secret...”	Humelsine signature and “I agree” by HST are identical in detail and placement. Wording very similar.
3	Twining to Truman 26 Sep 47 respectfully transmitting “Report on Flying Saucers”. File numbers from State Dept add authenticity.	Wedemeyer to Truman 19 Sep 47 respectfully transmitting “Report on China-Korea” (p. 215)	Similar language. Wedemeyer signature is a stamp, as was his custom.
4	Para. III.2 in the “First Annual Report very similar to above item. (p. 89)	Wedemeyer to Truman 19 Sep 47 respectfully transmitting “Report on China-Korea” (p. 215)	Similar but not identical language to the 26 Sep 47 report above.
5	Security page of “White Hot” report dated 19 Sep 46 , signed 24 Sep 47 by Harry Truman, with “I am keeping for further study” (p. 43)	Truman to Lovett memo, no date readily available.	The authentic Truman to Lovett memo has “I am keeping for further study” identical to the security page penmanship.
6	Hillenkoetter to Truman, Mar 48 stamp transmitting CIA summaries of “Majic” material. (p. 218 in 2000 Proceedings).	Marshall to FDR on Magic, 12 Feb 44, transmitting Army summaries of “Magic” material. (p. 218)	Very similar wording regarding the transmission of highly classified information on two classified programs. Similarity of Majic and Magic.
7	Marshall to Humelsine via Colonel Clarke, 27 Sep 47 (p. 219 in 2000 Proceedings)	Marshall to Dewey, 27 Sep 44 (See Lewin 1982)	Marshall is identified as Secretary of Defense. Language similar to authentic letter to Tom Dewey.

Table 4. Seven pairs of documents show similarities in wording, timing, and chirography that clearly warrant a discussion of why these similarities are present. Congratulations to Stan Friedman for locating these problem documents.

These problems will be discussed in detail at the July 2001 Symposium, providing new insight to their solution. The similarity of language cannot be ignored, nor can the identity of the penmanship. The preliminary “least unlikely” hypothesis is that Truman, Marshall, and Wedemeyer were all involved in the intentional creation of the emulations at the time, thereby continuing the process of deception already underway to protect the secrecy of the non-terrestrial projects at all costs as “Not for Public Inspection.”

Conclusion

The greatest secret of the 20th century—crash recoveries leading to a covert official UFO program—is being gradually revealed through the leaks of classified documents held in individual files for decades. Original documents can be dated back into the 1950s and no impressive reasons have come to light that would seriously impeach the authenticity of hundreds of pages of classified material, together with thousands of pages of supportive documentation. If these crashes and recoveries occurred, such documents ought to exist.

References

- Aldrich, Berliner, Deuley, Hall, Rodeghier, 1999. Joint Statement published electronically by SKYWATCH INTERNATIONAL INC. (A Non-Profit Organization). Administrative PO Box 900393; Membership PO Box 801; Postings/Mailing PO Box 2154.
- Deuley, T. 1999. "The other side of MJ-12." *MUFON UFO Journal*. May. p. 10.
- Deuley, T. 1999. "The other side of MJ-12, Part II." *MUFON UFO Journal*. June. p 10.
- Friedman, S. 2000. *MUFON International Symposium 2000*. pp. 193–220.
- Greenwood, B. 1999. Electronic Transmission.
- Lewin, R. 1982. *The American Magic*. Giroux, New York NY.
- Lockwood's Directory of papers and watermarks.
- Moore, W. & Shandera, J. 1990. *The MJ-12 Documents—An Analytical Report*. p. 52.
- Randle, K. 1997. *Conspiracy of Silence*. Avon Books, New York, pp. 285–290.
- Wedemeyer, A. C. 1958. *Wedemeyer Reports!* Henry Holt and Company, New York.
- Wood, R. *MUFON International Symposium 2000*, pp. 163–192
- Wood, R. & Wood, R. 1999. "Another Look at Majestic." *MUFON UFO Journal*. March. p. 11.